DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 252 IR 007 255

AUTHOR Monroe, Margaret B.
TITLE Analysis of the Shock Bibliography in Providing Bibliographic Access in Gerontology.
PUB DATE 22 Nov 77
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Gerontological Society Congress (San Francisco, California, November 22, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bibliographies; *Content Analysis; *Evaluation; *Gerontology; Library Research; Reference Materials; Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS Classified Bibliography Gerontology Geriatrics; *Shock (Nathan W)

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of the Shock bibliography, which appears regularly in the Journal of Gerontology was conducted in two modes: first, a survey of use and satisfaction of user needs among a 25 percent random sample of teaching and research faculty of the Faye McBeath Institute on Aging and Adult Life at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and second, a comparative content analysis of the coverage of the health sciences and social sciences aspects of gerontology by the Shock bibliography and Current Literature on Aging to develop a picture of the distinct roles played by these two continuing printed bibliographies of English language materials in the field. Findings emphasize the Shock bibliography's role as the basic bibliography in the field of gerontology, but indicate a need for expanded coverage of the social sciences aspects of the field, for restructure of terminology to stay abreast of developments in the field, for regular cumulation of listings, and for improved access to the content of foreign language materials. (Author/JVP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED171252

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Gerontological Society
Congress at San Francisco
November 22, 1977

ANALYSIS OF THE SHOCK BIBLIOGRAPHY IN PROVIDING BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS IN GERONTOLOGY

October 1977

Survey and Report by

Margaret B. Monroe

assisted by

Rhonda Gandel

University of Wisconsin - Madison
Library School

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Margaret E. Monroe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Abstract:

Evaluation of the Shock bibliography as it appears in the Journal of Gerontology, with focus on the year 1976, was conducted in two modes: (1) a survey of use and satisfaction of user needs among a 25% random sample of teaching and research faculty of the Faye McBeath Institute on Aging and Adult Life of the University of Wisconsin - Madison, and (2) a comparative content analysis of the coverage of health sciences and social sciences aspect of gerontology by the Shock bibliography and Current Literature on Aging, to develop a picture of the distinct roles these two continuing printed bibliographies of English language materials in gerontology. Findings emphasize the Shock bibliography's role as the basic bibliography in the field of gerontology, but emphasize its need for expanded coverage of social sciences aspects of the field, for restructure of terminology to stay abreast of development in the field, for regular cumulation of listings, and for improved access to the content of foreign language materials.

IR007265

The Classified Bibliography of Gerontology and Geriatrics, first compiled by Nathan W. Shock and published in 1951, covered the years 1900 to 1948. Shock undertook up-dating of this bibliography on a regular basis, listing current publications in the Journal of Gerontology. Cumulations to serve as supplements to the original bibliography were issued for the years 1949-1955 and 1956-1961. No cumulations have appeared since that time.

The reputation of the Shock bibliography as the basic bibliography in the field of English language materials on gerontology and geriatrics has not been challenged. The limitations of the bibliography, however, are widely understood to include the failure to match its major emphasis on bio-medical aspects of gerontology with equally comprehensive attention to social gerontology. Inevitably such a bibliography, organized by a classified arrangement of topics, opens itself to scrutiny for the revisions needed in the classified structure to match the evolution of the field. There is always, additionally, the concern for the currency and completeness of the regular listings, as well as for the adequacy of cumulations to aid in retrospective search, lest the basic bibliography in the field be reduced to the single function of a current awareness service.

This paper deals with two explorations into limitations of the Shock current listings in the Journal of Gerontology in serving the fields of the health sciences and the social sciences: a survey of use and satisfaction of user needs among a sample of teaching and research faculty, and a content analysis of the bibliography itself.

The contribution of the Shock bibliography, appearing regularly in the Journal of Gerontology, to current awareness and to retrospective search on aging and gerontology was the focus of an October 1977 inquiry among a random sample of University of Wisconsin - Madison faculty who are members of the Faye McBeath Institute on Aging and Adult Life.

The Sample Selection

Total Number of faculty members of Faye McBeath Institute on Aging and Adult Life	94	
Administration and Extension	14	
Teaching and Research	80	
Sample drawn from teaching and research	30	(38%)
Interviewed sample	20	(25%)

Method of Sample Selection

The five faculty members of the Faye McBeath Institute whose interest in the Institute is of an administrative nature, and who are not interested in either teaching or research in the area of gerontology, were eliminated before the random sample was drawn. These included the university system president, the vice chancellor and associate vice chancellor for the Center for Health Sciences, and deans of various schools. Also eliminated by their unavailability for interviewing were the nine faculty members from Extension. This left eighty (80) faculty members, from whom thirty (30) were randomly selected, using random number tables. Of the thirty selected, twenty (20) were available for interview. Those not available were not replaced.

TABLE 1

Profile of the Sample

Divisional Affiliations	No. in Sample	% (Sample)	%(Total Institute)
Health and Life Sciences	12	60%	54%
Social Sciences	8	40%	46%
Academic Rank			
Full Professors	11	55%	63%
Associate Professors	5	25%	20%
Assistant Professors	4	20%	10%
Lecturers	—	—	2%
Specialists	—	—	5%
Academic Roles in Gerontology			
Teaching Gerontology	15	75%	
Teaching courses fully in this field	5	25%	
Teaching courses tangentially in this field	17	85%	
Conducting research in gerontology	15	75%	
Conducting more than 1 project	10	50%	
Conducting more than 2 projects	3	15%	
Prime identification with research	10	50%	
Prime identification with teaching and practice	10	50%	

Fifteen-minute interviews consisting of twenty (20) major questions were conducted during a two-week period in mid-October, 1977, on the Madison campus. The interviewer set up appointments by telephone and conducted interviews in person in the office of each respondent. Information on library use was also generated and will be used in separate internal report. This report, on the other hand, deals specifically with the search sources, search patterns, and use of the Shock bibliography.

Role of the Shock Bibliography in Providing Access to Current Awareness and Retrospective Search

Journals are the most often used, most regularly used and "most heavily used source in the last month" for information on aging and

Gerontology. Only "literature searches," half of which are conducted in on-line data bases (MEDLARS/MEDLINE), approach journals in importance in this area. (See Table 2)

TABLE 2

Faculty's Regularly Used Sources of Information on Aging and Gerontology

	Most Often Used		Regularly Used		Used This Past Month	
SOURCES	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Journals	14	70%	20	100%	11	55%
Literature searches	12	60	15	75	7	35
Publishers catalogs	6	30	12	60	5	25
Bibliographies	5	25	15	75	6	30
Consulting Colleagues	4	20	10	50	2	10
Other	10	50	--	--	7	35
	Av. # identified=2.6 Range=1-5; S.D.=1.5		Av, #=3.6 Range=1-5; S.D.=1		Av. #=1.9 Range+0-5; S.D.=1.6	

In responding to the question asking for identification of the journal sources of "bibliographies you check regularly" for what you may need, the interviewees identified the Journal of Gerontology more often than any other single source:

SOURCE	PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS
Journal of Gerontology	45%
Gerontologist	30%
Psycological Bulletin	15%
Geriatrics	10%
Journal of Applied Physiology	10%
Other titles (single mentions)	85%

Profile of Faculty Citing Journal of Gerontology and its bibliographies as regularly checked
(n=9)

Divisional Affiliation		
Health Sciences	5	(56%)
Social Sciences	4	(44%)
Academic Rank		
Professor	3	(33%)
Assoc. Professor	4	(44%)
Asst. Professor	2	(22%)
Academic Roles in Gerontology		
Teaching only	2	(22%)
Teaching and Research	7	(78%)
Research only	0	

When directly shown a copy of the Journal of Gerontology, an additional 35% recalled as having used it occasionally. A prime use of the Journal of Gerontology is the use of the Shock bibliography to identify materials that the scanner need to read. There is even a somewhat higher percentage reporting use of the Shock bibliography than report use of the Journal of Gerontology itself!

USERS OF JOURNAL OF GERONTOLOGY	USERS OF SHOCK BIBLIOGRAPHY
30% use regularly	31% use regularly
15% use often	25% use often
35% use occasionally	31% use occasionally
20% never use	13% never use

Evaluation of Shock Bibliography

Despite the fact that 44% of users were from social sciences fields, only 31% of the subject area use was made in the social sciences field.

SUBJECT AREAS USED in Journal of Gerontology

69% health and life science
31% social sciences

Less intensive use of the bibliography is made in social science, although more comprehensive coverage might well be justified by the readiness of social science research workers and instructors to look to the Shock bibliography as a major source.

The satisfaction of users of the Shock bibliography suggests need for new approaches.

TABLE 3

USER SATISFACTION WITH SHOCK BIBLIOGRAPHY

	Very Satisfactory		Satisfactory		Somewhat Satisfactory		Not Satisfactory	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Health Sciences (60%)	1	5%	2	10%	7	35%	2	10%
Social Sciences (40%)	2	10%	1	5%	4	20%	1	5%
Total	3	15%	3	15%	11	55%	3	15%

One facet of the Shock bibliography which may lower the level of satisfaction is the wide gap between the terminology instinctive to the faculty researcher/teacher and the terminology used in the Shock bibliography. The interview sequence asked early (and not in the context of discussion of the Shock bibliography): "What are the specific subjects within the field of gerontology for which you usually search materials?" and then "Do you recall the subject headings under which you are most likely to find the information you need?" All respondents conducting searches could supply specific subjects, and eighteen (90%) recalled at least one subject heading. A comparison of the terms used for specific subjects (57) and subject headings (55) was made with the terms used by the Shock bibliography in the 1975-1976 issues of Journal of Gerontology. (See Table 4.) Two-thirds to three-quarters of the terms used by faculty researcher/teachers do not appear in the Shock bibliography, either as major headings or as sub-headings.

TABLE 4

Checklist of Subjects and Subject Headings Identified by Respondents as They Relate to Headings in the Shock Bibliography (Journal of Gerontology)

Terms	Subjects Cited No.	Subjects Cited %	Subject Headings Cited No.	Subject Headings Cited %
Exact Terms Used by Respondent Appears in Shock	7	12%	6	11%
First Word of Term Appears in Shock*	10	18%	4	7%
Keyword of Term Appears in Shock*	4	7%	3	6%
Term Does Not Appear in Shock**	36	63%	42	76%
Totals	57	100%	55	100%

*Terms accepted here are those satisfying subject inquiry.

**Terms used in Shock bibliography appearing in 1975 and 1976 issues of Journal of Gerontology.

The question occurred to the investigators that the sub-headings used in the fuller expansions in the cumulated volumes (up to 1961) might show the Shock bibliography to have a greater potential for meeting the current needs of teacher/research faculty in matching terms which they habitually use. A comparison was made with terms in the 1961 supplement and findings documented this surmise.

TABLE 5

Checklist of Subjects and Subject Headings Identified by Respondents as They Relate to Headings in the Shock Bibliography (1961 Cumulation)

	Subjects cited		Subject Heading Cited	
Terms	No.	%	No.	%
Exact Terms Used by Respondent Appears in Shock	19	33%	12	22%
First Word of Term Appears in Shock	4	7%	4	7%
Keyword of Term Appears in Shock	11	19%	9	16%
Term Does Not Appear in Shock	23	41%	30	55%
Totals	57	100%	55	100%

The search strategies of the faculty researcher/teacher show that fifteen (75%) personally use gerontology bibliographies or library card catalogs on gerontological subjects, but that all of these combine their own search efforts in this area with those of either a librarian or a student assistant. Only four (20%) relied solely on the search efforts of a student assistant, while one respondent (5%) made no use of bibliographies in search for materials on gerontology. Librarians are used by 55% of faculty. Student assistants are used by 65% of the faculty.

TABLE 6

Faculty Search Patterns

Search Pattern	No. Subjects	%
Self plus librarian plus student assistant	5	25%
Self plus librarian	6	30%
Self plus student assistant	4	20%
Student assistant only	4	20%
No bibliographic searches	1	5%
Total	20	100%

Librarians, however, were typically not used for assistance in search within bibliographies, but six out of eleven faculty cited the librarian as used for on-line searches with MEDLINES/MEDLARS. Inter-library loan assistance was the only other specific service cited as provided by librarians. Conscious use of librarians for identifying items within a printed bibliography was not a pattern. Testing Shock terminology against faculty-preferred terminology seemed, therefore, to have been the best choice for evaluation of match between tool and user.

Other evaluation of the Shock bibliography was provided by the faculty interviewed. When presented with copies of both the Shock bibliography and an issue of Current Literature on Aging, 65% expressed preference for Shock for their own purposes, while an additional 25% felt both would be useful to them. Thirty-five percent (35%), however, identified a bibliography closer to their needs in this field. Seven such bibliographies were identified, with Current Contents receiving three mentions and Index Medicus and Psychological Abstracts receiving two each. Six faculty reported using Index Medicus regularly, five used MEDLINES.

Preference for Shock among the 65% faculty responding was based on (1) coverage of biological and medical matters, (2) greater inclusiveness within subjects, (3) inclusion of articles as well as reports and monographs, and (4) its regular, bi-monthly appearance for up-dating.

Criticisms of the Shock bibliography stressed lack of coverage of social gerontology with the comprehensiveness needed, and the fact that items are typically out long in advance of their listing and appearance in the Shock bibliography.

Recommendations on the kind of bibliographic resources needed in gerontology included (1) need for a centralized bibliographic tool, for a federal clearinghouse similar to ERIC for information on gerontology, (2) bibliography with annotations, especially for foreign language articles, and (3) bibliography with greater sensitivity to new areas of research.

Content Analysis of Terms Used in Subject Heading Categories of Shock Bibliography

A second style of inquiry into the adequacy of coverage and access to gerontological literature by the Shock bibliography was made through a comparative content analysis of the coverage of the Shock bibliography and Current Literature on Aging. Since the Shock bibliography aims at comprehensiveness, with emphasis on bio-medical gerontology, and since Current Literature on Aging includes dominantly social gerontology, a comparison of coverage was designed to see whether there was a complementary role for these two bibliographies in respect to the items cited. A second major distinction between the two bibliographies, of course, is that Current Literature on Aging is annotated while the Shock bibliography is not. In a sense, then, this analysis was to disclose the individual roles of each bibliographic source.

Comparison of the Shock Bibliography as it appears regularly in the bi-monthly Journal of Gerontology with the quarterly Current Literature on Aging, published by the National Council on Aging, focussed on coverage of items cited, with secondary attention to the subject headings used to provide access to the items. There are some basic contrasts between the two bibliographies.

Shock Bibliography	Current Literature on Aging
1. Comprehensive in aim	1. Highly selective in coverage
2. Depth in biological and medical fields, with moderate coverage in social gerontology	2. Social gerontology focus and typically less attention to research literature than to materials for practitioners
3. A classified subject arrangement, almost taxonomic in style	3. Alphabetic arrangement of specific subject headings
4. About 27% items are in foreign languages	4. All items are in English
5. Chapters of books are often entered as separate bibliographic items in their precise subject categories	5. Each bibliographic unit is given only a single entry.
6. No annotations	6. Each item is annotated
7. Objective is to serve research	7. Objective is to serve practitioners
8. Author index annually	8. Subject and author indexes annually

A detailed analysis of the 1975 issues of Current literature on Aging shows that about 87% of the 308 items cited there were also cited in the Shock bibliography, although not always in 1975. Items cited in Current Literature on Aging but not included in Shock tended to fall into two classes: first, excluded categories such as handicapped, bibliotherapy, and general medical and nursing services when not specific to elderly; and second, individual articles overlooked, such as five articles on philosophy and image of aging, three on the elderly and their work, two each on demographics, catastrophic illness, legal services, social agencies, and social security, with thirteen other items in single category omissions.

On the other hand, detailed analysis of the 4119 citations in the Shock bibliography in 1976 showed 4% to be covered in Current Literature of Aging, with 9% of the social science citations included and 1.3% of

the health and life sciences citations included in Curren Literature. Because 24% of the citations in Shock represent foreign language materials, and because Current Literature on Aging includes only English language materials, it seems reasonable to point out that analysis of the 3123 Shock citations in 1976 showed 5.3% to be covered in Current Literature on Aging, with 11% of Shock's social science citations included and 1.7% of Shock's health sciences literature included.

We may conclude, therefore, that the role of Current Literature on Aging is confirmed as a highly selective, annotated list in social gerontology, and that it in no way replaces nor is replaced by the Shock bibliography as it appears in the Journal of Gerontology. We see the Shock bibliography, however, as the basic gerontological bibliography for English language materials and the prime access to a selection of foreign language materials as well. There is documented need for greater comprehensiveness in social gerontology, for a restructure of terminology, and for regularly cumulated volumes or computer-based cumulations, enabling more access points for the user and better organization for retrospective search.

The need for a similarly comparative analysis of the Shock bibliography with the literature available on MEDLINES/MEDLARS should be undertaken, although neither bibliography proposes to specialize in social gerontology. The total lack of a comprehensive listing of non-print materials (films, recordings, etc.) is a serious matter for the instructor in health sciences as in social sciences aspects of gerontology. A comprehensive approach to bibliographic control in this field is needed, in general as well as for the purpose of testing the directions in which the Shock bibliography should move.

Interview Schedule

I want to ask you a few questions about where and how you find the materials you need on aging and gerontology.

1. How do you most often come across the information you need on aging and gerontology? (Check or enter under other.) In which of these other ways do you usually find materials?

Last Month	Use	
_____	_____	(a) by reading journals regularly as they appear
_____	_____	(b) by scanning catalogs and brochures from publishers or the gerontological center publishing programs
_____	_____	(c) by consulting colleagues on your specific interests
_____	_____	(d) by using bibliographies
_____	_____	(e) by doing literature searches in the library
_____	_____	(f) other_____

_____

Which of the ways have you used this last month?

2. Which library collection best serves your needs for information and materials on aging and gerontology?

Last Month	Use	
_____	_____	(a) Memorial Library
_____	_____	(b) Social Work Library
_____	_____	(c) Middleton Health Services Library
_____	_____	(d) Public library
_____	_____	(e) Other (specify)_____

3. Which have you used for this purpose this past month?

4. NUMBER OF LIBRARIES REPORTED USED._____

5. What are the specific subjects within the field of gerontology for which you usually search materials?

(list)_____

_____

_____

_____

6a. Do you recall the subject headings under which you are most likely to find the information you need?

(list)_____

_____

_____

_____

b. Are these subject headings used in printed bibliographies or in library card catalogues? Can you identify the bibliographies you tend to use?

(list)_____

_____

c. Do you use these on your own? _____Yes _____No

Have you used the help of a librarian? _____

Have you used the help of a student assistant? _____

7. Can you recall the journals that you check regularly for bibliographies that may contain what you need?

(list) _____

_____

_____

8. Do you use (show sample issue)

	regularly	often	occasionally	never
Journal of Gerontology	_____	_____	_____	_____
Current Literature on Aging	_____	_____	_____	_____

IF YES, FOR BOTH GO ON TO 9A.

IF YES, FOR ONE, GO ON TO QUESTION 9A AND 9B1

IF NO, GO ON TO QUESTION 9B2

9a. How often do you use _____ to identify material you need to read?

	Shock	CLOA
Regularly	_____	_____
Often	_____	_____
Occasionally	_____	_____
Never	_____	_____

How satisfactory is _____ as a guide to the kinds of materials you need?

Shock: _____Very satisfactory _____ Satisfactory _____ Somewhat Satisfactory_____ Not satisfactory

CLOA: _____Very satisfactory _____ Satisfactory _____ Somewhat Satisfactory _____Not satisfactory

Which headings do you most use for the materials you need?

(list) _____

_____

_____

9b. 1. Will you look at this one (NOT USED) _____ and tell me which of the two you think you would prefer for your purposes?

9b. 2. Will you look these over for a few moments and tell me which one of the two you think you would prefer for your purposes?

PREFERENCE: _____ JG

_____ CLOA

Why do you prefer this one, can you say?

_____

_____

_____

10. Is there a better bibliography for your purposes than either of these?

YES (Title) _____

NONE _____

11. What recommendations would you make on bibliographic resources for your needs in aging and gerontology?

_____

_____

_____

12. Departmental affiliation _____

13. What subjects do you teach that involve gerontology?

Course # _____ Course Title _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

14. On what topics do you carry out research relating to aging and gerontology?

(list) _____

_____

_____

15. Are you a member of the Faye McBeath Institute on Aging?

Yes _____ No _____

16. Name of respondent _____

17. Position or rank _____

18. Date of interview _____

19. Time spent _____ minutes

20. Location: _____ office _____ library _____ other (list)

_____